



**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
UPLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2022
AT 6:30 P.M.**

1. CALL TO ORDER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Chair Aspinall called the regular meeting of the Upland Planning Commission to order at 6:32 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Upland City Hall.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was led by Commissioner Johnson.

3. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Aspinall, Vice Chair Grahn, Commissioners Caldwell, Johnson, Marotte, Mayer, and Staton.

Absent: None.

Staff present: Development Services Director and Planning Commission Secretary Dalquest, Planning Manager Farris, Associate Planner Sisk, Deputy City Attorney Maldonado, and Administrative Analyst Davidson.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Staton, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, and carried on a vote of 7-0, to approve the Regular Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of September 28, 2022, and the Special Minutes of October 5, 2022.

5. COUNCIL ACTIONS

Development Services Director Dalquest indicated that the City Council met on October 10, 2022 and October 24, 2022.

Development Services Director Dalquest reported that at the October 10, 2022 meeting, the City Council approved the ordinance regarding smoke shops and massage therapy establishments and also approved the Rose Glen Specific Plan.

Development Services Director Dalquest reported that at the October 24, 2022 meeting, the City Council approved the 2021-2029 Housing Element update and indicated it was mailed to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to start a 60-day review.

6. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Planning Manager Farris reported one future agenda item was anticipated to be heard by the Planning Commission on November 16th meeting; Dutch Bros Coffee drive thru located at 887 W. Foothill Boulevard.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Aspinall opened oral communications. There being no remote or in-person speakers, Chair Aspinall closed oral communications.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. LOCAL REGISTER NO. 22-0001

Project Description: Consideration to designate 2390 N. San Antonio Avenue to the local register of historic places. The property is located within the Single-Family Residential Low General Plan Designation and RS-15 Residential Single-Family Low Zone. (APN: 1043-011-02) (Staff Planner: Jacqueline Sisk)

CEQA Determination: The activity consists of placing the property on the Local Register for Cultural Resources and involves no modifications or expansions to the property. The action is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3), which is the commonsense exemption covering activities with no possibility of having a significant effect on the environment because it can be seen with certainty that listing of the property on the local registry will not result in changes or impacts to the environment.

Applicant: Roberta A. Lepins, 2390 N. San Antonio Avenue, Upland CA 91784

Appeal Period: The Planning Commission decision is final. An appeal period to contest this decision is October 27, 2022, to November 7, 2022.

Associate Planner Sisk presented the staff report, along with a PowerPoint Presentation, which is on file in the Development Services Department.

The Planning Commission inquired if staff anticipates whether the property owner would be submitting a Mills Act application and who the approving body is for such applications.

Associate Planner Sisk stated the applicant has submitted a Mills Act application and confirmed that City Council is the approving body for such applications.

Roberta Lepins, applicant, spoke to the history of the home during the "thriving citrus industry" and indicated that the Mills Act would help her maintain the home and keep it in its historic condition.

Chair Aspinall opened the public hearing.

Katy Parker, encouraged the Planning Commission to add this property to the City's designated list of historic resources, and noted that the home has not been significantly altered since it's construction in 1925. Parker indicated she evaluated the property and drafted the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms submitted with the application for designation.

There being no other remote or in-person speakers, Chair Aspinall closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission commented positively on the appearance and condition of the home; noted the significance of the original features within the home's interior;

and applauded the property owner's effort to add her property to the historic register to ensure its historic integrity is maintained.

It was moved by Commissioner Mayer, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, and carried on a vote of 7-0 to approve Local Register No. 22-0001.

B. ZONE CODE AMENDMENT NO. 22-0003

Project Description: Consideration of Zone Code Amendment No. 22-0003 to amend Upland Municipal Code Section 17.15.080(F) (Advertising Signs and Structures Near Freeways) by increasing the maximum twenty-five (25) foot height allowed for freeway-oriented advertising signs and allow property in the Regional Commercial zoning district that is not adjacent to a freeway to have a freeway-oriented advertising sign. (Staff Planner: Robert D. Dalquest)

CEQA Determination: This Ordinance is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.), pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15061(b)(3), the common sense exemption covering activities with no possibility of having a significant effect on the environment, and State CEQA Guidelines 15311 (Accessory Structures) regarding construction or replacement of minor structures accessory or appurtenant to existing commercial facilities.

Applicant(s): City of Upland, 460 North Euclid Avenue, Upland, CA 91786.

Appeal Period: There is no appeal period, the Planning Commission's decision is a recommendation to the City Council.

Development Services Director Dalquest presented the staff report and supplemental memorandum outlining revisions to the resolution, along with a PowerPoint Presentation which is on file in the Development Services Department.

The Planning Commission discussed the advantages and disadvantages between regulating the number of panels versus regulating the total square footage of sign area; inquired about whether single tenant sign poles is addressed in the ordinance; inquired about the freeway sign height regulations between signs in the Colonies and signs along the Interstate-10 freeway; requested clarification on how the maximum sign height and sign area would be measured under the ordinance; inquired about design criteria for letters and logos; inquired about sign height regulations for properties that are set back from the freeway; inquired about whether the 500-foot limit for the Mountain Green Center applied to the boundaries of the center just needing to be within 500 feet or if the location of the specific sign also had to be within 500 feet of the freeway; inquired whether the signs could be electronic changeable copy signs; and inquired whether there is a terracing effect on the amount of square footage allowed on a freeway sign based on the freeway sign height.

Development Services Director Dalquest suggested a desirable way to reduce sign clutter may be a combination of both limiting square footage and also setting a cap for the number of panels; single tenant freeway signs will need to have architectural elements and the support columns will need to have a decorative pole cover; spoke to differences between the Colonies Specific Plan, which has over one million square feet of rentable space, versus the multiple smaller parcels near the Interstate-10

freeway; clarified the method for which sign height would be measured as being from the finished grade to the upper most part of the sign structure; stated that design criteria can be defined by the Planning Commission as part of the ordinance; clarified that the maximum height of off-site signage is higher than the sign height immediately adjacent to the freeway in order for the signs to be visible by those on the freeway over that distance; confirmed that a freeway sign in the Mountain Green Center would have to be located within 500 feet of the freeway; clarified that the signs are not permissible as electronic changeable signs; and stated that the Planning Commission could determine if they would prefer to include language within the ordinance to have the maximum sign area of a freeway sign dependent on the height of the sign.

Chair Aspinall opened the public hearing.

Rick Batt, Sign Specialists Corporation, provided clarification regarding freeway visibility of potential freeway signs at the Mountain Green Center, indicating that only the top 10 to 15 feet of the sign will be the most visible and valuable to tenants, and advised against any regulations on panels sizes that would discourage tenants from incorporating corporate logos that were circular or would create signs that would be less aesthetically pleasing, by creating unnecessary negative space on a sign panel.

Dennis Loput, in-house Council for The Abbey Company, indicated that signage is critical for negotiating a lease with retail tenants and effects the amount of money the property owner can invest into a commercial center.

Molly Snowden, representative for landlord of Mountain Green Center, spoke of difficulties for advertising main tenants within the Mountain Green Center and indicated they would like to maintain 8 panels and have not discussed design parameters for the sign, so the renderings seen within the presentation are very preliminary.

Natasha Walton, resident, recommended that the Planning Commission not recommend approval to City Council of the ordinance and opined that increasing the height of freeway signs would create urban blight and destroy the view of the mountains. Walton expressed support in maintaining currently sign height regulations and related that such limitations emphasize a community's quality of life; suggested that shopping centers provide more shade trees to become more attractive to shoppers; expressed concern about poor maintenance of freeway signs; voiced a concern that large freeway signs could be a distraction to drivers; and opined that freeway signs are becoming more obsolete with the increase of advertising technology on the internet that are available on smart phones.

There being no other remote or in-person speakers, Chair Aspinall closed the public hearing.

Development Services Director Dalquest addressed changes outlined in the memorandum and suggested the re-inclusion of the language addressing "nonappurtenant free standing off-site signs" and "appurtenant fee standing signs". He asked that the Planning Commission consider criteria for pop-out of channel letters to emphasize an dimensional element, an appropriate maximum on the number of tenant panels, a maximum height of 45 feet for freeway adjacent properties within 250 feet of the freeway and 55 feet for off-site signage up to 500 feet away from the freeway.

The Planning Commission discussed preferences regarding the maximum height for freeway adjacent and non-adjacent signs, whether to limit the maximum number of panels or set a maximum square footage requirement, and recommendations for appropriate sign design requirements.

After hearing comments from each Commissioner, Chair Aspinall asked that staff further refine the sign details to reflect the majority position of the Commission, including: a maximum sign height of 45 feet for signs that are freeway adjacent, plus 10 feet if the sign is 10 feet or more below the grade of the freeway, a maximum sign height of 55 feet for non-adjacent signs a limitation on the overall square footage of sign area. The Commission requested that staff return with exhibits that provide a visual demonstration of the difference between 250 square feet, 300 square feet, and 350 square feet for freeway adjacent signs and 450 square feet for non-adjacent signs. The Commission also emphasized a desire for landscaping at the base of freeway signs to soften the appearance at grade level.

The Planning Commission unanimously agreed to prohibit the flat panel signs for freeway adjacent signs.

It was moved by Commissioner Mayer, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, and carried on a vote of 7-0 to continue close the public hearing and continue the item to the next regular meeting on November 16, 2022.

9. BUSINESS ITEMS – None.

10. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS – None.

11. ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Commissioner Staton, seconded by Commissioner Caldwell, and carried on a vote of 7-0 to adjourn the meeting.

At 8:52 p.m., Chair Aspinall adjourned the meeting. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is Wednesday, November 16, 2022.

SUBMITTED BY



Robert D. Dalquest, Secretary

APPROVED

November 16, 2022